

## CHAPTER 5:--LOCAL PARK AND RECREATION ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

A review of all community recreation plans on file with the Michigan DNR revealed that 773 distinct local units (townships, cities, counties, villages, school districts, regional authorities) have a current plan or had a current plan as recently as 2003. Each of these local unit park and recreation administrators were mailed a mail questionnaire by Michigan State University asking their preferences for the 2008-2012 SCORP, their ratings of the 2003-07 SCORP priorities and the trends regarding funding, land acquisition, development and employment by their agencies for the last five years and for the next five years. They received an initial mailing of the questionnaire, along with a cover letter and business reply envelope. The questionnaire was clearly identified on the cover as a "Local Park and Recreation Provider Survey" and was mailed from Michigan State University and returned to Michigan State University. The questionnaire, cover letter (consent form) and the survey procedures were all approved by the Institutional Review Board of Michigan State University per University policy. Ten days after the initial mailing, non-respondents were mailed a reminder postcard encouraging their response. Two weeks after the postcard, those who had still not responded were sent a second mailing of the questionnaire with a revised cover letter and another business reply envelope. All survey responses were due by August 17, 2007. The survey and initial cover letter are found in Appendix B.

Of the 773 addresses, none were unreachable. A total of 250 (32 percent) responded with a completed questionnaire. More than four in 10 local units with plans were townships, followed by cities which made up almost 30 percent of units with plans (Table 41). Responses by type of governmental unit were similar to their proportion of all local units with plans except that townships responded at a rate slightly higher than their proportion and cities and region entities at a rate slightly lower than their proportion.

Table 41--Proportion of Local Units with Plans and Their Response

TYPE OF GOVERNMENTAL UNIT	PERCENT IN SAMPLE	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS
<b>Township</b>	<b>42.8%</b>	<b>51.6%</b>
<b>City</b>	<b>29.6%</b>	<b>21.4%</b>
<b>Village</b>	<b>12.8%</b>	<b>11.3%</b>
<b>County</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>13.7%</b>
<b>Regional</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
<b>School district</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

When considering the planning region of the local units with plans and those who responded, region 1 north had the most local units in the sample and the largest proportion of respondents (Table 42 ). Every planning region of the state is represented by the respondents.

Table 42--Proportion of Local Units with Plans and Their Response by Planning Region

PLANNING REGION	PERCENT IN SAMPLE	PERCENT WHO RESPONDED
1 N	14.2%	16.0%
1 S	8.5%	3.2%
2	2.8%	4.0%
3	3.6%	4.8%
4	5.3%	2.8%
5	4.5%	5.2%
6	4.0%	6.4%
7	13.5%	15.6%
8	9.7%	12.0%
9	4.35	3.6%
10	9.45	8.8%
11	1.9%	2.0%
12	6.5%	6.8%
13	6.3%	3.6%
14	5.35%	5.2%

### Support for 2003-2007 SCORP Initiatives

When asked about their level of support for each of the seven initiatives in the 2003-2007 SCORP, strong support was expressed for all initiatives, with the strongest support for conservation of natural resources (Table 43). For every initiative, support was expressed by at least 78 percent of respondents and opposition to any given initiative was less than 3 percent.

Table 43--Rated Support of Initiatives from the 2003-2007 SCORP

INITIATIVE	STRONGLY SUPPORT %	MODERATELY SUPPORT %	NEUTRAL %	MODERATELY OPPOSE %	STRONGLY OPPOSE %
Conserve, protect and restore MI natural resources in public outdoor recreation venues	73.8%	21.7%	4.2%	0.4%	-
Improve cooperation among local, state and federal government and the private sector in the provision of outdoor recreation and sharing of comparable information	73.6%	18.2%	6.6%	1.7%	-
Improve community based outdoor recreation in MI	71.5%	22.2%	6.8%	-	-
Expand and develop the system of land and water based trails in MI	68.6%	20.2%	10.3%	0.8%	-
Provide appropriate access to enable all citizens to enjoy MI outdoor recreation, including those who are disabled	67.6%	22.4%	9.1%	0.8%	-
Improve the MI state park system	46.1%	32.8%	18.3%	2.9%	-
Improve the MI state forest recreation system	40.4%	38.3%	18.3%	2.5%	0.4%

When asked to suggest additional initiatives for the 2008-2012 SCORP, 24 percent of the respondents provided suggestions (Table 44). They often were a reaffirmation of the existing

seven initiatives (e.g. more trails, more non-motorized trails, more motorized trails, collaboration/cooperation, conservation, etc.). Some additional suggestions with capital improvement implications included more funding for capital improvements, additional parks and additional water access. Many suggestions focused on operations and included more programming, increased maintenance and more information/advertising/marketing.

Table 44--Initiative/Direction to Improve MI Outdoor Recreation Over the Next Five Years

INITIATIVE	PERCENT
<b>More funding</b>	<b>18.3%</b>
<b>Cooperation/collaboration</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
<b>More advertising/marketing</b>	<b>8.3%</b>
<b>More parks</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
<b>More access to water</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
<b>More trails (general)</b>	<b>5.0%</b>
<b>None/NA</b>	<b>5.0%</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>5.0%</b>
<b>More motorized trails</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>More non-motorized trails</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>Increased maintenance of facilities</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>More information on funding</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>More education</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>Make it affordable</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>Increase programming/activities</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
<b>Marinas</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
<b>Cleaner water</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
<b>Control of invasive species (on land)</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
<b>Conservation/preservation/restoration</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

When asked how their agency acted in support of the 2003-2007 SCORP initiatives/directions, the highest percentage indicated that they had provided access to outdoor park and recreation venues (Table 45). Surprisingly, less than two-thirds reported that they had improved community-based outdoor recreation during the previous five years. Relatively few reported actions that would improve state parks or the state forest recreation system. This was expected as relatively few local units adjoin these lands. Also, those two initiatives were targeted at DNR capital improvements.

Table 45--Local Unit Support for 2003-2007 SCORP Initiatives

INITIATIVE	PERCENT
<b>Provide appropriate access to enable all citizens to enjoy MI outdoor recreation, including those who are disabled</b>	<b>68.2%</b>
<b>Improve community based outdoor recreation in MI</b>	<b>65.4%</b>
<b>Expand and develop the system of land and water based trails in MI</b>	<b>58.3%</b>
<b>Improve cooperation among local, state and federal government and the private sector in the provision of outdoor recreation and sharing of comparable information</b>	<b>57.7%</b>
<b>Conserve, protect and restore MI natural resources in public outdoor recreation venues</b>	<b>51.9%</b>
<b>Improve the MI state park system</b>	<b>7.6%</b>
<b>Improve the MI state forest recreation system</b>	<b>6.0%</b>

To improve access, agencies complied with updated guidelines for outdoor recreation facilities, with special emphasis on providing accessible recreation facilities, such as paved trails, and support facilities, such as accessible restrooms. Actions to improve community outdoor recreation included day to day program operations, adding courts, fields and other outdoor sports facilities and reaching out to community members to understand their needs through planning. Key activities noted to conserve natural resources were land acquisition, tree planting and cooperating with the DNR in efforts to improve environmental quality. In regard to trails, most actions included construction or improvement of non-motorized trails. For improved collaboration and cooperation, important actions included extending trails to neighboring jurisdictions, entering into multi-jurisdictional authorities, jointly advocating for favorable policies and legislation and increased communications. Actions related to state parks and state forests included participating in litter cleanups, serving on advisory committees and exploring arrangements such as leases.

When asked what they perceived to be the most significant barriers to greater citizen participation in outdoor recreation; local budget limitations, resulting in a lack of facilities and services were viewed as the greatest barrier (Table 46). Other major barriers to outdoor recreation included a lack of accessibility to opportunities, fees/prices and a lack of knowledge/awareness about opportunities.

Table 46--Perceived Barriers to Greater Citizen Participation in Outdoor Recreation

<b>BARRIER</b>	<b>FIRST MOST IMPORTANT BARRIER</b>	<b>SECOND MOST IMPORTANT BARRIER</b>
<b>Budget limitations/lack of funding</b>	<b>39.8%</b>	<b>18.8%</b>
<b>Lack of facilities/land/trails</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>20.3%</b>
<b>Lack Accessibility</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>6.8%</b>
<b>High cost/price</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
<b>Lack awareness/knowledge/marketing</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>15.8%</b>
<b>Lack interest</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>6.0%</b>
<b>Limited water access</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>
<b>Time constraints</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>None/NA</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>
<b>Location of parks</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Lack maintenance</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
<b>Insufficient transportation</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Vandalism/Dumping</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
<b>Lack programs</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>6.0%</b>
<b>Lack staff</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
<b>Lack public support</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
<b>Poor planning</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### **Meeting 2008-2012 Outdoor Recreation Needs and Demands**

When asked to look ahead to the period of the updated SCORP (2008-2012) regarding capital improvements needed in their jurisdiction, local units rated the importance of a variety of capital improvement projects on a scale of 1 (unimportant) to 5 (highly important). Land-based trails was the most highly rated, with universal access, picnic areas and playgrounds close behind (Table 47). The least important was shooting ranges or hunting opportunities.

Table 47--Importance of Outdoor Recreation Capital Improvement Options

CATEGORY OF OUTDOOR RECREATION CAPITAL PROJECT	MEAN IMPORTANCE
<b>Land based trails</b>	<b>3.9</b>
<b>Universal access to outdoor recreation</b>	<b>3.6</b>
<b>Picnic areas</b>	<b>3.7</b>
<b>Playgrounds</b>	<b>3.7</b>
<b>Outdoor ball fields/courts</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Open space, land conservation</b>	<b>3.3</b>
<b>Access to Great Lakes, lakes or rivers</b>	<b>3.2</b>
<b>Campgrounds</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<b>Shooting range or hunting opportunity</b>	<b>1.8</b>
<b>Other outdoor capital project (a)</b>	<b>3.3</b>

Rating scale: 1= unimportant to 5= highly important.

(a) Other projects include splash pad/spray park, shower/restroom building (type park unspecified), bike/skate park,

Slightly less than one-third of responding local units plan to spend something to acquire land within the next five years (Table 48). The funding needs for these projects for land acquisition were substantial, with an estimated \$167 million. Key acquisition needs include property for open space/land conservation, trails and surface water access. Considering that this survey response is a reflection of only a portion of the local units of government that are potentially able to apply for grants (LWCF and MNRTF), this is a very conservative estimate of total need over the period 2008-2012.

Table 48--Projected Land Acquisition Needs for Local Units 2008-2012

CATEGORY OF OUTDOOR RECREATION CAPITAL PROJECT	% PLANNING ON SPENDING SOMETHING	MEAN	SUM
<b>Land based trails</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>\$125,522</b>	<b>\$25,355,421</b>
<b>Universal access to outdoor recreation</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>19,005</b>	<b>\$3,630,000</b>
<b>Picnic areas</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>\$3,212</b>	<b>\$636,000</b>
<b>Playgrounds</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>\$10,717</b>	<b>\$2,175,500</b>
<b>Outdoor ball fields/courts</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>\$28,302</b>	<b>\$5,632,000</b>
<b>Open space, land conservation</b>	<b>30.9%</b>	<b>\$621,569</b>	<b>\$112,504,000</b>
<b>Access to Great Lakes, lakes or rivers</b>	<b>13.9%</b>	<b>\$943,467</b>	<b>\$16,824,000</b>
<b>Campgrounds</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>\$21,509</b>	<b>\$3,721,000</b>
<b>Shooting range or hunting opportunity</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>\$60</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>
<b>Other outdoor capital project (a)</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>\$38,580</b>	<b>\$3,125,000</b>
<b>ALL</b>	<b>35.4%</b>	<b>\$697,081</b>	<b>\$167,299,521</b>

(a) Other includes land for splash pad/spray park, bike/skate parks, disc golf course, etc.

Two-thirds of responding local units plan to spend something on facility development during 2008-2012 (Table 49). While estimated costs per projects generally are smaller, the greater number of development projects contemplated would require over \$304 million from 2008-2012. Development of facilities for land-based trails and supporting appropriate public use of general land conservation/open space comprise over half of the financial portion of the development need.

Table 49--Projected Development Needs for Local Units 2008-12

CATEGORY OF OUTDOOR RECREATION CAPITAL PROJECT	% PLANNING ON SPENDING SOMETHING	MEAN	SUM
Land based trails	48.5%	\$399,397	\$80,678,200
Universal access to outdoor recreation	44.2%	\$139,432	\$26,492,000
Picnic areas	50.5%	\$51,693	\$10,235,200
Playgrounds	57.1%	\$88,266	\$17,918,000
Outdoor ball fields/courts	51.0%	\$121,265	\$24,253,000
Open space, land conservation	32.65	\$437,889	\$79,258,000
Access to Great Lakes, lakes or rivers	30.0%	\$162,588	\$2,925,804
Campgrounds	17.3%	\$72,237	\$12,497,000
Shooting range or hunting opportunity	3.0%	\$5,220	\$937,000
Other outdoor capital project (a)	12.9%	\$64,100	\$15,961,000
ALL	68.3%	\$1,269,890.6	\$304,773,754

In response to a list of selected funding sources for capital improvements, local units are most likely to include some level of general fund and MNRTF funds toward their planned capital improvements (Table 50). However, only slightly more than one-fourth of the investment is likely to come from general tax dollars, while almost three-fourths will come from grants; a sizeable portion of that from non-governmental sources. Grants are increasingly linked to a wide range of other endeavors including open space conservation, economic development and the generosity of individuals and charitable organizations.

Table 50--Anticipated Capital Funding Sources and Proportion of Funding Met by Source for 2008-2012

SOURCE	% USING SOURCE	MEAN % NEED MET BY SOURCE
Local government general fund dollars	81.9%	27.9%
MNRTF	63.2%	23.9%
Individual donations	35.5%	2.6%
Corporate donations/grants	34.8%	4.3%
LWCF	34.2%	6.8%
Private foundation/conservancy grants	32.9%	4.7%
State/federal transportation grants	29.7%	6.9%
Parks/recreation/trail/other friends group(s)	21.3%	2.3%
Park/recreation/open space millage	20.6%	8.6%
Unmet needs/no source known or contemplated	20.0%	7.7%
Other (a)	16.1%	4.1%
TOTAL	NA	100.0%

(a) Other includes downtown development authority, transfers from units within region to the regional entity, fees places in restricted funds, etc.

### Trends in Funding, Employees and Park Numbers and Acreage

For the 227 local units that reported on their operations budget situation in fiscal year 2007, the total budget for park and recreation operations was estimated to be \$152 million (Table 51). Funding levels varied widely by jurisdiction, not necessarily by type of government. Median funding levels suggest that county and regional park and recreation entities are most likely to have the highest levels of funding. This is logical since they typically represent a larger population and also are likely to have a larger tax base on which to draw.

Table 51--Local Unit 2007 Fiscal Year Operations Budget for Parks and Recreation

TYPE OF GOVERNMENT	% BUDGETING SOMETHING	MEAN OPERATIONS BUDGET	MEDIAN OPERATIONS BUDGET	SUM OF OPERATIONS BUDGET
<b>Township</b>	<b>92.2%</b>	<b>\$147,256</b>	<b>\$23,000</b>	<b>\$17,081,722</b>
<b>City</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$1,148,580</b>	<b>\$220,500</b>	<b>\$59,726,159</b>
<b>Village</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$41,892</b>	<b>\$34,000</b>	<b>\$1,005,408</b>
<b>County</b>	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>\$1,379,405</b>	<b>\$375,000</b>	<b>\$41,382,164</b>
<b>Regional</b>	<b>75.0%</b>	<b>\$8,155,100</b>	<b>\$375,200</b>	<b>\$32,620,400</b>
<b>School District</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$228,856</b>	<b>\$228,856</b>	<b>\$228,856</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>95.2%</b>	<b>\$669,800</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$152,044,709</b>

The primary source of 2007 fiscal year operations funding for parks and recreation was local general fund dollars (Table 52). However, though general fund sources on average comprised almost two-thirds of operations funding across units, many large programs were more reliant on millages and user fees.

Table 52--Mean Proportion of Funding Sources Used by Responding Local Units

FUNDING SOURCE	% OF 2007 FISCAL YEAR OPERATIONS BUDGET
<b>Local general fund</b>	<b>63.8%</b>
<b>User fees</b>	<b>16.1%</b>
<b>Millage</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
<b>Private gifts, grants, donations, in-kind labor</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
<b>Other sources (a)</b>	<b>4.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(a) Other includes concession sales, etc.

Although local general fund dollars were most likely to be used to some extent as a park and recreation operations funding source across all types of local government, more than half of all cities, counties and regional entities reported generating funds for park and recreation operations from user fees (Table 53). Volunteers, grants and donations also are important as more than 30% of every type of entity directly benefits from these efforts.

Table 53--Funding Sources for Park and Recreation Operations Funding 2007

FUNDING SOURCES FOR PARKS AND RECREATION	ALL UNITS	TOWNSHIP	CITY	VILLAGE	COUNTY	REGIONAL	SCHOOL DISTRICT
<b>Local general fund dollars</b>	<b>83.1%</b>	<b>87.0%</b>	<b>82.4%</b>	<b>91.3%</b>	<b>63.3%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>User fees (entrance, activity, etc.)</b>	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>64.0%</b>	<b>30.4%</b>	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Private gifts, grants, donations, in-kind labor</b>	<b>35.9%</b>	<b>35.4%</b>	<b>38.0%</b>	<b>30.4%</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Local millage for parks, recreation, open space</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>10.3%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Other (a)</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>-</b>

(a) Includes: concession sales



Over the past five years, the proportion of agencies increasing their dependence on user fees, millages and private gifts and donations has risen across all types of local government (Table 54). Townships and villages have been more likely to have increases in the amount of funding from general funds compared to other sources. Conversely, cities, counties and regional entities have seen a greater decline in general fund spending for park and recreation operations.

Table 54--Local Units Funding Source Increasing or Decreasing Compared to Other Sources Over Past 5 Years (2003-2007)

TYPE OF GOVERNMENT	GENERAL FUND		USER FEES		MILLAGE		PRIVATE GIFTS, GRANTS, DONATIONS, VOLUNTEERS		OTHER SOURCES	
	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.
<b>Township</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>
<b>City</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>37.1%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Village</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>23.1%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>92.9%</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>County</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>30.4%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>18.8%</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Regional</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>School District</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

Projecting over the next five years, local units expect to further increase their dependence on user fees, millages, private gifts/volunteers and other sources and decrease their dependence on general fund dollars (Table 55). The only exception is townships, where slightly more indicate there will be more money from general fund dollars in next five years.

Table 55--Local Units Funding Source Increasing or Decreasing Compared to Other Sources Over Next Five Years (2008-2012)

TYPE OF GOVERNMENT	GENERAL FUND		USER FEES		MILLAGE		PRIVATE GIFTS, GRANTS, DONATIONS, VOLUNTEERS		OTHER SOURCES	
	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.
<b>Township</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>15.7%</b>	<b>34.1%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>31.4%</b>	<b>11.4%</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>
<b>City</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>27.8%</b>	<b>41.9%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>15.8%</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Village</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>18.8%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>County</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>43.5%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>17.6%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Regional</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>School District</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>

Of responding local units, all types of local government were more likely to report increasing park and recreation operations budgets over the past five years than decreasing budgets except for cities (Table 56). For the next five years however, the picture is more pessimistic for all types except townships and regional entities.



Table 56--Local Units with Increases or Decreases in their Park and Recreation Operations Budgets

TYPE OF GOVERNMENT	2003-2007 BUDGET		PROJECTED 2008-2012 BUDGET	
	% INCREASE	% DECREASE	% INCREASE	% DECREASE
<b>Township</b>	<b>38.5%</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>42.7%</b>	<b>12.0%</b>
<b>City</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>37.7%</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>28.3%</b>
<b>Village</b>	<b>44.0%</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>48.0%</b>	<b>24.0%</b>
<b>County</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>
<b>Regional</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>School district</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Townships, villages and regional entities more likely had increases rather than decreases in the number of permanent park and recreation employees over the past five years (Table 57). Conversely, cities and counties were more likely to suffer from a reduced number of permanent employees. Looking to the near future (2008-2012), all types of government except cities project they will be hiring additional permanent park and recreation employees.

Table 57--Park and Recreation Permanent Employees for Fiscal Year 2007

TYPE OF GOVERNMENT	MEAN # PERMANENT EMPLOYEES	% DECREASING 2003-2007	% INCREASING 2003-2007	% EXPECTING DECREASING 2008-2012	% EXPECTING INCREASING 2008-2012
<b>Township</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>21.8%</b>
<b>City</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>31.9%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
<b>Village</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>
<b>County</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>
<b>Regional</b>	<b>65.5</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>25.0%</b>
<b>School District</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

The proportion of local park and recreation entities with an increased number of temporary employees is greater than those who had fewer temporary employees over the past five years (Table 58). Looking to the future, respondents in all types of local government project they will be hiring additional temporary employees.

Table 58--Temporary Employees

TYPE OF GOVERNMENT	MEAN # PERMANENT 2007 EMPLOYEES	% DECREASING 2003-2007	% INCREASING 2003-2007	% EXPECT DECREASING 2008-2012	% EXPECT INCREASING 2008-2012
<b>Township</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>37.5%</b>
<b>City</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>
<b>Village</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20.0%</b>
<b>County</b>	<b>36.6</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>30.8%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>42.3%</b>
<b>Regional</b>	<b>223.0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>66.7%</b>
<b>School District</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

With the exception of cities, a higher proportion of all other local units anticipate they will be establishing additional parks during 2008-2012 than actually did from 2003-2007 (Table 59). More than half of all regional entities responding felt they would be establishing new parks during 2008-2012.

**Table 59--Trends in Parks and Number of Parks**

TYPE OF GOVERNMENT	2007 MEAN	% INCREASING 2003-2007	% EXPECT INCREASING 2008-2012
<b>Townships</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>26.0%</b>
<b>City</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>23.5%</b>
<b>Village</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>22.7%</b>
<b>County</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>25.8%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>
<b>Regional</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>66.7%</b>
<b>School District</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

A slightly higher proportion of local units feel they will be adding parkland acreage rather than expanding the number of parks (Table 60). This is the result of many expanding existing parks, rather than establishing new parks. Across every type of local government, more respondents project they will add parkland acreage from 2008-2012 than they did from 2003-2007.

**Table 60--Number of Parkland Acres for 2007**

TYPE OF GOVERNMENT	MEAN	MEDIAN	SUM	% INCREASING 2003-2007	% EXPECT INCREASING 2008-2012
<b>Townships</b>	<b>90.5</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>9,317.4</b>	<b>18.8%</b>	<b>29.5%</b>
<b>City</b>	<b>283.8</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>13,336.5</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>
<b>Village</b>	<b>28.7</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>544.5</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>21.1%</b>
<b>County</b>	<b>522.5</b>	<b>239.5</b>	<b>15,673.9</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>40.0%</b>
<b>Regional</b>	<b>8,607.5</b>	<b>1,617.5</b>	<b>25,822.5</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>School District</b>	<b>300.0</b>	<b>300.0</b>	<b>300.0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

### Summary

In summary, local units, like citizens, are strongly supportive of all the 2003-2007 SCORP goals. When asked to suggest additional SCORP goals, few were provided and many further emphasized their support of existing goals, especially those related to non-motorized trails. The projected requests for grant funds over the next five years appear to continue the trend in outdoor recreation capital improvement grant programs in Michigan; that requests will far outstrip available funds. Over a five-year period, respondents to the survey detailed over \$460 million worth of needed capital improvements, with development needs exceeding acquisition by a 2:1 margin. This subset of local units who responded to the questionnaire appear to favor acquisition much more than the examination of all community plans in force reported earlier. Considering trends in operations funding and employees, some local units, especially cities, project some very financially challenging times ahead for outdoor recreation budgets. Nevertheless, many local units of all types expect to invest in additional parks, park facilities and parkland, emphasizing the importance of outdoor recreation to the general welfare of the citizens they serve. Many also expect to more heavily rely on sources of revenue for capital improvements and operations other than general fund monies, including more emphasis on user fees, dedicated millages, donations, volunteers and private foundations. The importance of state and federal grants for capital improvements remains strong.

